# UNCLASSIFIED

# AD NUMBER ADB106467 LIMITATION CHANGES TO: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited. FROM: Distribution authorized to DoD only; Specific Authority; SEP 1986. Other requests shall be referred to Chief of Naval Operations (OP-04), Washingotn, DC 20350-2000. **AUTHORITY** cna ltr via cno dtd 3 feb 1988

13. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION   15. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS   15. CHARLES   15. CH	R	EPORT DOCUM	ENTATION F	PAGE		
Distribution limited to DOD agreeds and).  Specific Authority: W0014-83-C-0725. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Chief of Naval Department (OP-04).  REFERENMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)  CRC 552  53. NAME OF REFERENMING ORGANIZATION  Center for Naval Langiyes  CNA  55. DOFFICE SYMBOD. (flappilicable)  CRA 401 Ford Avenue Alexandria, Virginia 22302-0268  33. NAME OF FENDONC/ORGANIZATION  (flappilicable)  Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-04)  75. ADDRESS (CRy, State, and ZIP Code)  Navy Department  Washington, D. C. 20350-2000  34. NAME OF FENDONC/ORGANIZATION  (flappilicable)  Office of Naval Research  Navy Department  Washington, D. C. 20350-2000  35. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER  Notice of Naval Research  Notice of Naval Research  Notice of Naval Research  Notice of Naval Research  Office of Naval Research  Navy Department  Washington, D. C. 20350-2000  36. DODRESS (Cry, State, and ZIP Code)  Navy Department  Washington, D. C. 20350-2000  37. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER  Notice of Naval Research  Navy Department  Washington, D. C. 20350-2000  Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-04)  Office of the Chief o			1b. RESTRICTIVE	MARKINGS	<del></del>	
Specific Authority: N00014-83-C-0725. Other requests for this document must be referred to the Chief of Naval Decestions (PO-04)	2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION	AVAILABILITY O	F REPORT	
S. MOMITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)  5. MOMITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)  5. MAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION  Center for Naval Analyses  6. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)  4401 Ford Avenue Alexandria, Virginia 22302-0268  8. MAME OF HUNDING / ORGANIZATION  Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-04)  7. D. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)  Navy Department Washington, D.C. 20350-2000  8. D. OFFICE SYMBOL  (If applicable)  Office of Naval Research  Nound-3-C-0725  Nound-STRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER  NOUND-3-C-0725  NOUNT STRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER  NOUND-3-C-0725  NOUNT STRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER  NOUNT STRUMENT IDENTIFICA	2b. DECLASSIFICATION / DOWNGRADING SCHEDUL	E	Specific Authority	: N00014-83-C-0	725. Other red	quests for this document
CRC 552  5a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Center for Naval Analyses CNA CPAPPICABLE CNA CPA	4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	S)	5. MONITORING	ORGANIZATION R	Val Operations EPORT NUMBE	(OP-04). R(S)
Center for Naval Analyses  CNA  Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-04)  6c. ADDRESS (Ctr., State, and ZiP Code)  4401 Ford Avenue Alexandria, Virginia 22302-0268  8a. NAME OF FUNDING / ORGANIZATION  Office of Naval Research  Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-04)  Navy Department Washington, D. C. 20350-2000  8b. OFFICE SYMBOL  (If applicable) ONR  NO. 14-83-C-0725  9c. ADDRESS (Ctr., State, and ZiP Code)  NO. OSURCE OF PUNDING / ORGANIZATION NUMBER  PROCECT ALINGTON, Virginia 22217  10. SOURCE OF PUNDING NUMBERS  PROCECT ALINGTON, Virginia 22217  11. ITTLE (Include Security Classification) Sources of Tanker Tonnage for Wartime Logistical Support: Projections of the Commercial Fleet and the Ready Reserve Force  12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Ronald F. Rost 13a. TYPE OF REPORT Final  15b. TIME COVERED FROM January 1986  16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION  17. COSATI CODES 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)  17. COSATI CODES 18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)  18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)  19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)  This research contribution makes projections of tanker tonnage and the numbers of tankers available to support  U.S. forces in wartime for 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2010. The key finding of the analysis is that the supply of tankers will sunderway. If DOD continues to rely on the Ready Reserve Force to fill the shortfall in the numbers of available tankers, by the mid-1990s the fleet of reserve tankers would have to be expanded to about triple the size DOD currently anticipates. Accordingly, the study recommends that the Navy consider the alternative policy of outsourcing for delivering fuel to armed forces during wartime.  20. OISTRIBUTION AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFICATION Unclassified  21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified  22. OFFICE SYMBOL	CRC 552				_	
Center for Naval Analyses  CNA  Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OP-04)  76. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZiP Code)  77. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZiP Code)  78. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZiP Code)  Navy Department Washington, D.C. 20350-2000  8a. NAME OF FUNDING / ORGANIZATION  Office of Naval Research  Navy Department Washington, D.C. 20350-2000  9. PROCEMENT INSTRUMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER N00014-83-C-0725  8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZiP Code)  10. SURCEOF SUNDING MUMBERS PROGRAM PROJECT FASK  NOO. ACCESSION NO.  RO148  PROJECT FASK NORY UNIT ACCESSION NO.  RO148  PROJECT FASK NORY UNIT ACCESSION NO.  RO148  NOO. ACCESSION NO.  RO148  NOO. ACCESSION NO.  RO148  PROJECT FASK NORY UNIT ACCESSION NO.  RO148  NOO. ACCESSION NO.  RO148  PROJECT FASK NOO. WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.  RO148  NOO. ACCESSION NO.  RO148  PROJECT FASK NOO. WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.  RO148  PROJECT FASK NOO. WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.  RO148  PROJECT FASK NOO. ACCESSION NO.  RO148  PROJECT FASK NOO. WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.  RO148	6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION	6b. OFFICE SYMBOL	7a. NAME OF MO	NITORING ORGAL	VIZATION	<del></del>
Adol Ford Avenue   Alexandria, Virginia 22302-0268   Navy Department   Washington, D.C. 20350-2000	Center for Naval Analyses	(If applicable) CNA	7.1			OP-04)
A401 Ford Avenue Alexandria, Virginia 22302-0268  3a. NAME OF FUNDING / ORGANIZATION Office of Naval Research  3b. OFFICE SYMBOL (**Tappikable*) ONE ONE OF STANKER OF FUNDING NUMBERS N00014-83-C-0725  10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS PROGRAM PROJECT ELEMENT NO. NO. RO148  PROJECT NO. RO148  PROJECT NO. RO148  NO. RO148  PROJECT NO. RO148  NO. RO148  PROJECT NO. RO148  NO. RO148  NO. RO148  PROJECT SAK WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. RO148  NO. RO148  NO. RO148  PROJECT SAK WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. RO148  NO. RO148  PROJECT NO. RO148  NO. RO148  NO. RO148  NO. RO148  NO. RO148  PROJECT SAK WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. RO148  NO. RO148  PROJECT SAK WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO. RO148  PROJECT SAK UNIT SAK UNIT SAK UNIT SAK UNIT ACCESSION NO. RO148  PROJECT SAK UNIT	6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) .		7b. ADDRESS (City	State and ZIP C	ode)	
Office of Naval Research  ONR  NO0014-83-C-0725  10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS  PROGRAM ELEMENT NO. 65154N  R0143  PROJECT ELEMENT NO. R0143  NO. ACCESSION NO. ACCESSION NO. R0143  NO. ACCESSION NO. ACCESSION NO. R0143  NO. ACCESSION NO. R0143  NO. ACCESSION NO. A			Navy Departm	ent		
800 North Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217    PROGRAM   PROJECT   TASK   NO.   NO.		(If applicable)			ENTIFICATION	NUMBER
800 North Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217    PROGRAM   PROJECT   TASK   NO.   NO.	8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		10 SOURCE OF FU	NOING NUMBER		
Sources of Tanker Tonnage for Wartime Logistical Support: Projections of the Commercial Fleet and the Ready Reserve Force  132. PERSONAL AUTHOR(5) Ronald F. Rost 133. TYPE OF REPORT Final 134. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) FROM January 1986 TO May 1986 155. PAGE COUNT FIELD GROUP FIELD GROUP Sub-GROUP Capacity, Commercial ships, DWT (deadweight tons). Fleets ships). Fuel, HSTE (handy-sized tanker equivalent). Jones Act, Logistic support, Military operations, MSC (Military Sealist Command). Naval vessels, NDRF (National Defense Reserve Force). Oil, Petroleum. Requirements. RRF (Ready Reserve Force). Tankers, Transport  19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)  This research contribution makes projections of tanker tonnage and the numbers of tankers available to support U.S. forces in wartime for 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2010. The key finding of the analysis is that the supply of tankers will fall far short of estimated Department of Defense (DOD) requirements. This rapid shrinkage of tankers is deemed likely because domestic crude oil production is projected to decline substantially, and because additional pipeline construction is underway. If DOD continues to rely on the Ready Reserve Force to fill the shortfall in the numbers of available tankers, by the mid-1990s the fleet of reserve tankers would have to be expanded to about triple the size DOD currently anticipates. Accordingly, the study recommends that the Navy consider the alternative policy of outsourcing for delivering fuel to armed forces during wartime.  20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED SAME AS RPT. DIICUSERS  21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified 222. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL	800 North Quincy Street		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK	
18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)  GROUP SUB-GROUP Capacity, Commercial ships, DWT (deadweight tons), Fleets (ships), Fuel, HSTE (handy-sized tanker equivalent), Jones Act, Logistic support, Military operations, MSC (Military Sealift Command), Naval vessels, NDRF (National Defense Reserve Force), Oil, Petroleum, Requirements, RRF (Ready Reserve Force), Tankers, Transport  19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)  This research contribution makes projections of tanker tonnage and the numbers of tankers available to support U.S. forces in wartime for 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2010. The key finding of the analysis is that the supply of tankers will fall far short of estimated Department of Defense (DOD) requirements. This rapid shrinkage of tankers is deemed likely because domestic crude oil production is projected to decline substantially, and because additional pipeline construction is underway. If DOD continues to rely on the Ready Reserve Force to fill the shortfall in the numbers of available tankers, by the mid-1990s the fleet of reserve tankers would have to be expanded to about triple the size DOD currently anticipates. Accordingly, the study recommends that the Navy consider the alternative policy of outsourcing for delivering fuel to armed forces during wartime.  20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT  UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED  SAME AS RPT. DICCUSERS  21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  Unclassified  22. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code)  22. COFFICE SYMBOL	12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Ronald F. Rost  139. TYPE OF REPORT 136. TIME COVER	ED	14. DATE OF RE	PORT (Year, Mor		15. PAGE COUNT
FIELD GROUP SUB-GROUP Capacity, Commercial ships, DWT (deadweight tons), Fleets ships), Fuel, HSTE (handy-sized tanker equivalent), Jones Act, Logistic support, Military operations, MSC (Military Sealift Command), Naval vessels, NDRF (National Defense Reserve Force), Oil, Petroleum, Requirements, RRF (Ready Reserve Force), Tankers, Transport  19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)  This research contribution makes projections of tanker tonnage and the numbers of tankers available to support U.S. forces in wartime for 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2010. The key finding of the analysis is that the supply of tankers will fall far short of estimated Department of Defense (DOD) requirements. This rapid shrinkage of tankers is deemed likely because domestic crude oil production is projected to decline substantially, and because additional pipeline construction is underway. If DOD continues to rely on the Ready Reserve Force to fill the shortfall in the numbers of available tankers, by the mid-1990s the fleet of reserve tankers would have to be expanded to about triple the size DOD currently anticipates. Accordingly, the study recommends that the Navy consider the alternative policy of outsourcing for delivering fuel to armed forces during wartime.  20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT  UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED  SAME AS RPT.  DTICUSERS  21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  Unclassified  222. OFFICE SYMBOL						
13 10 tanker equivalent), Jones Act, Logistic support, Military operations, MSC (Military Sealift Command), Naval vessels, NDRF (National Defense Reserve Force), Oil, Petroleum, Requirements, RRF (Ready Reserve Force), Tankers, Transport  19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)  This research contribution makes projections of tanker tonnage and the numbers of tankers available to support U.S. forces in wartime for 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2010. The key finding of the analysis is that the supply of tankers will fall far short of estimated Department of Defense (DOD) requirements. This rapid shrinkage of tankers is deemed likely because domestic crude oil production is projected to decline substantially, and because additional pipeline construction is underway. If DOD continues to rely on the Ready Reserve Force to fill the shortfall in the numbers of available tankers, by the mid-1990s the fleet of reserve tankers would have to be expanded to about triple the size DOD currently anticipates. Accordingly, the study recommends that the Navy consider the alternative policy of outsourcing for delivering fuel to armed forces during wartime.  21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  Unclassified  22. OFFICE SYMBOL  22. OFFICE SYMBOL	3337776300	18. SUBJECT TERMS (	Continue on reverse	if necessary and	identify by blo	ck number)
Command), Naval vessels, NDRF (National Defense Reserve Force), Oil, Petroleum, Requirements, RRF (Ready Reserve Force), Tankers, Transport  19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)  This research contribution makes projections of tanker tonnage and the numbers of tankers available to support U.S. forces in wartime for 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2010. The key finding of the analysis is that the supply of tankers will fall far short of estimated Department of Defense (DOD) requirements. This rapid shrinkage of tankers is deemed likely because domestic crude oil production is projected to decline substantially, and because additional pipeline construction is underway. If DOD continues to rely on the Ready Reserve Force to fill the shortfall in the numbers of available tankers, by the mid-1990s the fleet of reserve tankers would have to be expanded to about triple the size DOD currently anticipates. Accordingly, the study recommends that the Navy consider the alternative policy of outsourcing for delivering fuel to armed forces during wartime.  21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified  22. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT Unclassified  22. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL  22. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL  22. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL	300 01.001	tanker equivalent)	al ships, DWT (dead	iweight tons), Fle	ets (ships), Fue	l, HSTE (handy-sized
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)  This research contribution makes projections of tanker tonnage and the numbers of tankers available to support U.S. forces in wartime for 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2010. The key finding of the analysis is that the supply of tankers will fall far short of estimated Department of Defense (DOD) requirements. This rapid shrinkage of tankers is deemed likely because domestic crude oil production is projected to decline substantially, and because additional pipeline construction is underway. If DOD continues to rely on the Ready Reserve Force to fill the shortfall in the numbers of available tankers, by the mid-1990s the fleet of reserve tankers would have to be expanded to about triple the size DOD currently anticipates. Accordingly, the study recommends that the Navy consider the alternative policy of outsourcing for delivering fuel to armed forces during wartime.  20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT  UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED  SAME AS RPT.  DTIC USERS  21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  Unclassified  22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL  22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code)  22c OFFICE SYMBOL		Command), Naval ve	ssels, NDRF (Natio	onal Defense Rese	erve Force), Oil	C (Military Sealift , Petroleum,
This research contribution makes projections of tanker tonnage and the numbers of tankers available to support U.S. forces in wartime for 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2010. The key finding of the analysis is that the supply of tankers will fall far short of estimated Department of Defense (DOD) requirements. This rapid shrinkage of tankers is deemed likely because domestic crude oil production is projected to decline substantially, and because additional pipeline construction is underway. If DOD continues to rely on the Ready Reserve Force to fill the shortfall in the numbers of available tankers, by the mid-1990s the fleet of reserve tankers would have to be expanded to about triple the size DOD currently anticipates. Accordingly, the study recommends that the Navy consider the alternative policy of outsourcing for delivering fuel to armed forces during wartime.  21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified  22. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL  22. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL  22. SELECTION (Include Area Code)  22. OFFICE SYMBOL	10 40570457/6			con rankers, tra	rrahoer	
UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED SAME AS RPT. DTIC USERS Unclassified  22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL  Vir. Frank Quarto  (22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code)  (22c. OFFICE SYMBOL)	This research contribution makes puls. Some sine wartime for 1990, 1995, 200 fall far short of estimated Department of I because domestic crude oil production is pulse is underway. If DOD continues to rely cankers, by the mid-1990s the fleet of researching terms. Accordingly, the study recommends	projections of tanke 00, and 2010. The k Defense (DOD) requirojected to decline s on the Ready Reserve tankers would	r tonnage and to key finding of the irements. This substantially, a tree Force to fill	ne analysis is rapid shrinka and because ac l the shortfal	that the sup age of tanker iditional pip l in the nur	ply of tankers will rs is deemed likely eline construction nbers of available
Mr. Frank Quarto	l <del>_</del>	ſ. □ OTIC USERS			CATION	
	22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Mr. Frank Quarto		22b. TELEPHON	E (Include Area C	ode) 22c OFF	

LIBRARY
RESEARCH REPORTS DIVISION
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93940

# FOR WARTIME LOGISTICAL SUPPORT: PROJECTIONS OF THE COMMERCIAL FLEET AND THE READY RESERVE FORCE

Ronald F. Rost

### DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Distribution limited to DOD agencies only. Specific Authority: N00014-83-C-0725.

Other requests for this document must be referred to the Chief of Navai Operations (OP-04).



4401 Ford Avenue • Post Office Box 16268 • Alexandria, Virginia 22302-0268 • (703) 824-2000

### 17 October 1986

### MEMORANDUM FOR THE DISTRIBUTION LIST

Subj: Center for Naval Analyses Research Contribution 552

Encl: (1) CNA Research Contribution 552, "Sources of Tanker Tonnage for Wartime Logistical Support: Projections of the Commercial Fleet and the Ready Reserve Force," by Ronald F. Rost, Unclassified, September 1986

- 1. Enclosure (1) is forwarded as a matter of possible interest.
- 2. This is the second in a series of anticipated publications prepared in connection with CNA's Strategic Sealift project. This research contribution projects the size of the U.S.-flag commercial tanker fleet over the next 25 years, and estimates the required size of the tanker portion of the Ready Reserve Force.
- 3. Research contributions are distributed for their potential value in other studies and analyses. They do not necessarily represent the opinion of the Department of the Navy.

Robert J. Ravera

Vice President

Naval Planning, Manpower, and Logistics Division

Distribution List Reverse page

# Subj: Center for Naval Analyses Research Contribution 552

# Distribution List

SNDL	
41A	COMSC
	Attn: M-6
	Attn: 3T5
B2A	DTIC (2 copies)
E3D1	CNR
FF18	NAVTACSUPPACT
FF38	USNAV
FF42	NAVPGSCOL
FF44	NAVWARCOL

OPNAV OP-91 OP-095 OP-04 OP-40 OP-41 OP-42 OP-60

# Other

Defense Fuel Supply Center Maritime Administration, Office of Policy and Plans Commission on Merchant Marine and Defense

# FOR WARTIME LOGISTICAL SUPPORT: PROJECTIONS OF THE COMMERCIAL FLEET AND THE READY RESERVE FORCE

Ronald F. Rost

Naval Planning, Manpower, and Logistics Division



4401 Ford Avenue • Post Office Box 16268 • Alexandria, Virginia 22302-0268

# ABSTRACT

This research contribution makes projections of tanker tonnage and the numbers of tankers available to support U.S. forces in wartime for 1990, 1995, 2000, and 2010. The key finding of the analysis is that the supply of tankers will fall far short of estimated Department of Defense (DOD) requirements. This rapid shrinkage of tankers is deemed likely because domestic crude oil production is projected to decline substantially, and because additional pipeline construction is underway. If DOD continues to rely on the Ready Reserve Force to fill the shortfall in the numbers of available tankers, by the mid-1990s the fleet of reserve tankers would have to be expanded to about triple the size DOD currently anticipates. Accordingly, the study recommends that the Navy consider the alternative policy of outsourcing for delivering fuel to armed forces during wartime.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	. v
Introduction	. 1
Findings and Recommendations	. 2
Tanker Fleet Projections	. 5
Why the Projections Differ	. 9
Translating Oil Flows Into Tanker Tonnage	. 10
Projections for 1995	. 16
Projections for 2000 and 2010	. 22
Alternative Scenarios	. 23
References	. 25
Appendix: Projection Tables	_ A_23

# LIST OF TABLES

		Page
1	Projected Size of the RRF Tanker Fleet	2
2	Sizing the Tanker RRF for 1990: Original Estimate and Revisions	4
3	Projected Shortfalls of Militarily Useful Tankers	6
4	Projected U.SFlag Commercial Tanker Fleet	6
5	Militarily Useful Tankers in U.SFlag Commercial Fleet	7
6	Why the Projections Differ	9
7	Projected Crude Oil Flows in 1990	11
8	Projected Refined Product Flows in 1990	11
9	Projected Inter-PADD Crude Oil Flows in 1990	12
10	Projected Inter-PADD Refined Products Flows in 1990	13
11	Projected U.SFlag Domestic Tanker Demand in 1990	14
12	Militarily Useful Tankers in the Crude Trades in 1990	16
13	Oil Market Projections: An Overview	17
14	Projected Crude Oil Flows in 1995	18
15	Projected Refined Product Flows in 1995	18
16	Projected Inter-PADD Crude Oil Flows in 1995	19
17	Projected Inter-PADD Refined Product Flows in 1995	20
18	Projected U.SFlag Domestic Tanker Demand in 1995	21

# LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

		Page
19	Sensitivity of the Tanker Shortfall to Domestic Crude Oil Production	23
20	Alaskan Export Scenario	
	***************************************	24

## INTRODUCTION

Commercial tanker capacity under the U.S. flag has been declining and is expected to continue doing so in the years ahead. Since 1970, the number of U.S.-flag tankers that are militarily useful has fallen about 60 percent, and the carrying capacity of this component of the fleet has decreased about 30 percent. In the event of a major armed conflict at the end of the decade, it is unlikely that the remaining U.S.-flag tankers would be capable of providing adequate logistical support for both U.S. armed forces and essential economic activity. By the mid-1990s, the shortfall is expected to be even greater.

U.S.-flag tankers are not competitive on international trade routes, where they face competition from foreign-flag ships. To operate under the U.S. flag, a tanker must be constructed in a U.S. shippard and must be manned with U.S. nationals. For about one-third the cost, comparable vessels can be built abroad and operated with foreign crews. In the past, these cost disadvantages were offset, at least partially, by construction differential subsidies (CDS) and operational differential subsidies (ODS). Under the current administration, however, CDS has been cancelled and no new ODS contracts are being offered, although payments under existing contracts are continuing. If maritime policies are not changed, few if any U.S.-flag tankers will survive on international routes.

Under the Jones Act, the domestic trades are protected; only U.S.-flag tankers can transport crude oil and refined petroleum products from point to point within the United States, including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Tankers in these trades enjoy a protected market and thus do not receive any subsidy payments. Nonetheless, Jones Act tankers still face competition from alternative modes of transportation: pipelines and barges. Unfortunately, domestic crude oil production is expected to decline at least through the mid-1990s, and pipelines and barges are likely to capture larger shares of the shrinking market. Thus, tankers will be less in demand.

The Navy has responded to these trends by purchasing militarily useful tankers that otherwise would be scrapped by owners unable to operate them profitably. The tankers are maintained in a high degree of readiness in the Ready Reserve Force (RRF). In this way, the shrinkage can be curtailed. Valuable assets merely are transferred from private ownership to ownership by the U.S. Navy.

A pressing question is: How large can the RRF tanker fleet grow relative to the active U.S.-flag tanker fleet and still be a workable option for

maintaining adequate tanker capability? In the event of RRF activation, the Maritime Administration exercises General Agency Agreement contracts with commercial operators, who have agreed to obtain merchant mariners for the RRF ships from union sources. Of course, this procedure is workable only as long as sufficient numbers of merchant sailors are available. If the active commercial fleet continues to decline, as appears likely, unemployed or underemployed sailors will switch occupations, and more yards will close. Furthermore, in an era of increasingly austere defense budgets, a large tanker RRF simply may not be affordable.

The study results reported in this paper indicate how large the RRF would have to be to fill the shortfall between tanker requirements and available capacity. Specifically, the size of the RRF in future years is estimated by using the Department of Defense (DOD) estimate of tanker capacity required to support military operations and subtracting the projected U.S.-flag tanker capacity that will be available, as determined from this research.

# FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The tanker fleet under U.S. flag is projected to continue its rapid decline through the mid-1990s. At that time, the fleet is likely to "hit bottom" far short of the numbers needed to support military operations. To fill the shortfall, the tanker portion of the RRF would have to be expanded to about 104 handy-sized tanker equivalents (HSTEs) by 1990, and 129 by 1995. These numbers are shown in table 1.

TABLE 1

PROJECTED SIZE OF THE RRF TANKER FLEET
(Thousands of deadweight tons)

	1984	1990	1995	2000
Required fleet <sup>a</sup> Active fleet <sup>b</sup>	7,416 <u>8,635</u>	7,416 4,554	7,416 <u>3,864</u>	7,416 <u>3,954</u>
RRF fleet	_259 <sup>c</sup>	2,862	3,552	3,462
RRF fleet in HSTEs	9	104	129	126

a. These are DOD estimates for 1990-91. The figure is assumed to be the same for other years.

c. The actual tonnage.

Tankers withheld for identified military requirements (with total capacity of 415,000 DWT) are not included.

Required tanker capacity to support military operations is shown in line 1 of table 1 in thousands of deadweight tons (DWT). The requirement was determined in [1] for the year 1990. Requirements were not estimated for later years, so the figure is assumed to remain unchanged. In line 2, the projected capacity of the active fleet is shown. It is made up of militarily useful tankers in the U.S.-flag commercial fleet, the Military Sealift Command (MSC) fleet, and the Effective U.S. Control (EUSC) fleet. The latter is composed of vessels owned by U.S. citizens or corporations that operate under flags of convenience. By doing so, these owners avoid the sizable costs of building and crewing in the U.S. It is assumed by DOD that EUSC tankers would be made available during a military crisis.

The RRF is sized to fill the shortfall, as shown in line 3 in thousands of DWT and in line 4 in handy-sized tanker equivalents (HSTEs). An HSTE is defined as a tanker with a 200,000-barrel capacity. A little less precisely, an HSTE can be defined as a 27,500-DWT coated tanker. These definitions are merely common denominators; the actual tankers acquired for the RRF need not be 27,500 DWT. Only militarily useful tankers are candidates for the RRF, and they may be larger than 27,500 DWT. A tanker generally is deemed militarily useful if it is between 6,000 and 82,000 DWT, and if its tanks are coated. The latter is necessary to facilitate the cleaning of the tanks between shipments. Some tankers in the 90,000-DWT class also are considered militarily useful. To the extent that tankers larger than 27,500 DWT are acquired, the actual number of tankers in the RRF would be less than the HSTE number.

Acquiring an RRF of 129 handy-sized tankers is not the end of the story, however. Although 129 HSTEs, along with tankers of the active U.S.-flag and EUSC fleets, would be adequate to fulfill the requirement for direct military support, they would not fulfill the requirement for essential economic support. The Economic Support Shipping study conducted by the Maritime Administration [2] found that economic support would require militarily useful tanker capacity of about 1.3 million DWT, or about 45 HSTEs. DOD intends to meet this additional requirement by purchasing tankers for the National Defense Reserve Fleet (NDRF). The RRF is an "elite subset" of the NDRF. Other components of the NDRF—including the economic-support tankers—generally are older and are maintained in a lower state of readiness.

According to the CNA projections of U.S.-flag tanker capability, the tanker shortfall will be considerably larger than earlier DOD estimates. As shown in table 2, the DOD sealift tanker analysis [1] originally anticipated a need for only 16 handy-sized tankers in the RRF in 1990. Later developments

prompted a downward revision of the DOD projections of commercial tanker fleet size and a consequent upward revision of the tanker component of the RRF to 46. The CNA estimate of 104 is the result of a detailed modeling process (described herein) that derives projections of the commercially viable U.S.-flag tanker fleet from projected requirements to move crude oil and refined petroleum products around the U.S. Explicit account was taken of developments in petroleum and tanker markets that were not as readily identifiable at the time of the DOD analysis: the outlook for domestic oil production is substantially weaker for both 1990 and 1995, and pipeline capacity is expected to expand more rapidly.

TABLE 2

SIZING THE TANKER RRF FOR 1990: ORIGINAL ESTIMATE AND REVISIONS

HSTEs
16
· 46
104

These findings raise serious doubts about the viability of the RRF as the sole offset to the shrinking commercial tanker fleet over the long term. By 1995, the capacity in deadweight tons of active militarily useful tankers flying the U.S. flag will be about 2.8 million –2.2 million for the commercial fleet and another 0.6 million for the MSC fleet. To fill the requirements shortfall, RRF capacity would have to be larger than that of the active fleet: about 3.6 million, or over 50 percent of the total tanker assets under the U.S. flag. Even if the capability to crew and activate a large RRF continued to exist, the costs of procuring, upgrading, and maintaining it probably would be about triple the cost anticipated by the Navy for a 46-tanker RRF in 1990. (The precise costing of the RRF through 2010 will be reported in a subsequent paper.)

The only other option for delivering the fuels required to support military operations is outsourcing: reliance by DOD on foreign refineries and possibly on foreign-flag, foreign-owned tankers. A recommendation that follows from the findings of this study is that the Navy examine closely the outsourcing option. It would be a major departure from current wartime logistical planning, but in the absence of substantial changes in U.S. maritime

policies, it probably will not be possible to maintain enough tanker capability under U.S. flag to meet currently defined DOD requirements.

# TANKER FLEET PROJECTIONS

The CNA projections of the militarily useful tanker assets available to support military operations are shown in table 3 for 1990, 1995, and 2000. The RRF component of the fleet represents current DOD plans to increase its size to 46 HSTEs. Thus, tanker shortfalls of about 58 HSTEs in 1990 and 83 HSTEs in 1995 are projected to remain even after current DOD plans to expand the RRF are carried out.

The reason for the remaining shortfalls is that the U.S.-flag commercial tanker fleet is expected to decline substantially faster than the earlier DOD projections had anticipated. The projections for the other components of the fleet, MSC tankers and EUSC tankers, are almost identical to those made by DOD. The MSC fleet is expected to remain constant, and the EUSC component is carried over from [1] merely to maintain comparability. In [1] the capacity of the EUSC fleet was assumed to remain at its 1985 level. That assumption was justified by arguing that it was difficult to project with much precision how the size of the EUSC fleet might change in the years ahead, so it was preferable to not count on growth that might not occur. In addition, the EUSC fleet is viewed as something of a weak link in the available fleet. because there is doubt among some observers about whether these tankers would be made available. After all, they are mainly under Liberian flag and have Third World crews. The CNA analysis has focused on U.S.-flag assets. More in-depth projections of the EUSC fleet would require a separate analysis.

Details of the CNA projections of the U.S.-flag commercial tanker fleet are displayed in tables 4 and 5. Table 4 contains projections for the whole fleet, and table 5 shows projections of the militarily useful component. Vessels in the domestic or Jones Act trades are of two types:

- Crude-carrying tankers that move Alaskan North Slope and offshore California oil to the West Coast, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands (via the Cape), and Panama; and from Panama to the Gulf Coast, East Coast, and Puerto Rico.
- Clean-product tankers that move refined products from the Gulf Coast to the East Coast, fromPuerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to the East Coast, and along the U.S. coasts.

PROJECTED SHORTFALLS OF MILITARILY
USEFUL TANKERS
(Thousands of deadweight tons)

1990	1995	2000
6,239	5,549	5,639
576	576	576
2,897	2,207	2,297
1,270	1,270	1,270
1,496	1,496	1,496
415	415	415
5,824	5,134	5,224
7,416	7,416	7,416
1,592	2,282	2,192
58	83	80
	6,239 576 2,897 1,270 1,496 <u>415</u> 5,824 7,416 1,592	6,239 5,549 576 576 2,897 2,207 1,270 1,270 1,496 1,496  415 415  5,824 5,134  7,416 7,416 1,592 2,282

TABLE 4

PROJECTED U.S.-FLAG COMMERCIAL TANKER FLEET

	1000	4005	2000
<u> </u>	1990	1995	2000
Jones Act trade	79	61	77
Refined products	35	38	38
Crude oil	44	23	39
CDS	12	8	0
Total	91	69	77
Total in thousands of DWT	6,878	4,506	5,666

TABLE 5

MILITARILY USEFUL TANKERS IN U.S.-FLAG COMMERCIAL FLEET

	1990	1995	2000	
Jones Act trade	51	43	51	
Refined products	35	38	38	
Crude oil	16	5	13	
CDS	12	8	0	
Total	63	51	51	
Total in thousands of DWT	2,897	2,207	2,297	

All of the tankers operating in the refined product trades are militarily useful, while the bulk of the crude-carrying tankers are not. These latter tankers are too large, and some of their tanks are uncoated and thus too difficult to clean sufficiently to carry refined products. The crude-carrying tankers are projected to decline rapidly in number through the mid-1990s, largely reflecting the anticipated declines in Alaskan North Slope oil output.

Tankers operating in the refined product trades show no further shrinkage after 1990, because their trade is not affected by the increased imports of crude oil that will be necessary to compensate for the declines in domestic production. The crude oil refined on the Gulf Coast—whether domestic or imported—still must be transported to the East Coast in Jones Act tankers if it is to move by tanker at all. The bad news for military planners is that most of the Gulf-to-East Coast trade is likely to be captured by barges and pipelines. For example, in 1990, refined product shipments from the Gulf Coast to the East Coast are projected at a rate of 2.7 million barrels per day, but only about 27 percent will be carried over water. The rest will move by pipeline. Moreover, of the 731,000 barrels per day left over for waterborne carriage, about 58 percent will be shipped in barges, leaving only about 314,000 barrels per day for clean-product tankers. Accordingly, their remaining numbers are small in the 1990s.

The CDS fleet is comprised of tankers that were built for international trade. They received CDS funds for construction, and they continue to receive ODS payments under existing contracts. Unless they are granted special 6-month waivers, these tankers are excluded from the Jones Act trades. Instead, they must compete against foreign-flag vessels on international

routes. At present, ten large tankers comprising more than 60 percent of the CDS tonnage are laid up, because international rates have hovered near cash costs as a result of excess tanker supply. Even with ODS payments, operating costs of U.S. tankers are well above those of foreign competitors. This situation is not likely to improve anytime soon: more than 80 very large crude carriers (VLCCs) and ultralarge crude carriers (ULCCs) were scrapped from the world tanker fleet, but the decrease in supply was offset by a 10-percent decline in worldwide demand in 1985. The laidup U.S.-flag tankers were built in the mid-1970s and are approaching the midpoint of their expected lives. The longer they remain in layup, the greater the costs of activation; and the older they are, the less the payback. Given the bleak outlook for carriage rates over the next few years, it is unlikely that these tankers have any future other than the boneyard.

CDS tankers currently have the option of paying back constructiondifferential subsidies and entering the Jones Act trades. This CDS payback option has a 1-year window that ends in June 1986. Reference [1] projected that 22 CDS tankers-almost the entire fleet-would opt for payback and displace some of the older, smaller tankers currently operating in the Alaskan trades. That would have been an unfortunate development for the Navy, because the tankers likely to have been displaced are militarily useful, while the VLCCs and ULCCs that might have entered the domestic trades are not. Fortunately, however, the DOD projection was far too high. To date, only two tankers have exercised the option, and the total is unlikely to go higher than three. Why have more ULCCs and VLCCs not chosen to enter a market in which they would be able to compete against older, less efficient U.S.-flag ships and face no competition from foreign vessels? Because their rates would have to incorporate the CDS payback costs, while many of the tankers currently in the Alaskan trades need only cover operating costs. Under such circumstances, the CDS vessels would not be able to capture cargo at profitable rates.

About a dozen smaller CDS tankers—ranging from 35,000 to 92,000 DWT—probably will survive to 1990, and only about eight still will be active in 1995. Before 2000, under current maritime policies, the entire CDS fleet will have vanished because ODS contracts will have expired. At present, 17 CDS tankers are operating mostly in trades generally reserved for U.S.-flag ships: short term, or spot charters to MSC, and grain shipments under special government programs (such as Public Law 480). The small number of CDS tankers that might continue operating in the early 1990s will be relying primarily on these sources for business.

# WHY THE PROJECTIONS DIFFER

The CNA projections of active tanker capacity in 1990 are substantially lower than those made by DOD. Table 6 quantifies the main factors responsible for the difference. DOD originally projected that the U.S.-flag commercial tanker fleet would consist of 155 ships in 1990, and that 106 of them would be militarily useful. Later, DOD adjusted its projection downward to account for the anticipated building of the transgulf pipeline and for CDS payback. In retrospect, these adjustments were largely unnecessary. The transgulf pipeline project was to have converted a gas-transmission pipeline between Baton Rouge and Port Everglades to clean-products service. If so, about eight militarily useful tankers would have been displaced from the Gulf-to-East Coast trades. However, the project has been defeated by a coalition of marine and environmental interests.

TABLE 6
WHY THE PROJECTIONS DIFFER

	U.Sflag commercial tankers		
Original DOD projection [1]	155		
CDS payback All American pipeline Stiffer foreign competition Lower domestic crude production Larger average vessel size	-3 -11 -11 -30 -9		
CNA projection	<u>– 5</u> 91		

The factors other than CDS payback that are listed in the table were not accounted for in the DOD estimates. The All American pipeline will carry crude oil from California to the Gulf Coast, displacing about 11 tankers on the West Coast-to-Panama and Panama-to-Gulf Coast routes. A larger displacement—about 30 tankers—will result from lowered projections for domestic crude oil production. When oil prices are low, domestic exploration, drilling, and development grinds to a halt because it is cheaper to import more oil from developed fields abroad. The bulk of imported oil arrives in lower cost foreign-flag tankers. The current weakness in oil markets is unlikely to reverse itself quickly; its continuation over the next few years limits domestic

crude oil output levels into the mid-1990s. As discussed above, CDS tankers cannot compete against foreign-flag tankers in the present pricing environment, and as a result, about 11 of these tankers are likely to be scrapped before 1990. Finally, some of the smaller tankers in the West Coast trades probably will be squeezed out not so much because of CDS payback, but more generally because of tough competition in a declining market.

# TRANSLATING OIL FLOWS INTO TANKER TONNAGE

Of the three components of the U.S.-flag tanker fleet, only the Jones Act tankers were projected on the basis of the model presented in this section. The procedure is displayed in tables 7 through 11 and is briefly described in the accompanying text. The methodology and data sources for this model are fully explained in a separate paper [3]. The other fleet components—MSC tankers and CDS tankers—were projected differently, as explained above.

The Jones Act tanker fleet derives its business from the movement of crude oil and refined petroleum products around the United States. The first task is to project shipments of crude oil and of refined products between different regions. For that purpose, the country—including the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico—is divided into Petroleum Administration for Defense Districts, or PADDs. The projected crude oil flows underlying the tanker projection are shown for 1990 in table 7, and the corresponding refined product flows are shown in table 8. The procedure begins with projections of the totals in the right-hand column. These totals are allocated among the PADDs under the assumption that the current pattern of oil flows reflects production, cost, and marketing efficiencies that are slow to change. By making use of the accounting identity between sources and uses of oil for each PADD (and current patterns of inter-PADD shipments and receipts) the projections for shipments to other PADDs are derived.

Next, shipments are further disaggregated by (1) mode of transportation and (2) PADD of destination. This is necessary because tanker demand varies with destination and length of trade route, and also because different shares of trade are captured by pipelines and barges on different routes. These projections are shown in tables 9 and 10. The key numbers to focus on in table 9 are waterborne shipments out of PADD V (the West Coast, including Alaska). This trade supports an important segment of the Jones Act crude-carrying tanker fleet. The other source of commercial business for Jones Act crude-carrying tankers is trade within PADD V, from Valdez (Alaska) to the West Coast and to Hawaii. That trade is examined in table 11. It can be seen in

table 9 that crude oil also is carried via water from PADD III (the Gulf Coast) to PADD II (the Midwest). Only small inland vessels are employed on that route, hence they are ignored in this study. About 400,000 barrels of crude per day are projected to move by pipeline from PADD V to PADD III, mainly through the All American pipeline. Should that pipeline fail to materialize, tanker demand would be up by about 11 vessels.

TABLE 7

PROJECTED CRUDE OIL
FLOWS IN 1990
(Thousands of barrels per day)

	PADDI	PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
Sources							
Crude oil production	76	760	3,420	532	2,812	0	7,600
Crude oil imports	1,007	1,536	2,833	30	264	330	6,000
Receipts from other PADDS	91	<u>778</u>	<u>572</u>	_0	0	<u>119</u>	<del></del>
Total crude supply	1,174	3,074	6,825	562	3,076	449	13,600
Uses							
Crude runs	1,129	3,074	6,134	476	2,339	449	13,600
Shipments to other PADDS	45	0	691	86	737	0	,
Crude oil exports	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 8

PROJECTED REFINED PRODUCT
FLOWS IN 1990
(Thousands of barrels per day)

PADD I	PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
1,129	3,074	6,134	476	2,339	449	13,600
1,432	288	360	24	168	128	2,400
3,173	1,254	217	84	137	0	_,
231	378	<u>1,197</u>	<u>63</u>	231	_0	2,100
5,965	4,994	7,908	647	2,875	577	18,100
5,512	4,550	4,025	551	2.625	236	17,500
422	401	3,605	96	0	341	,
31	43	279	0	250	0	600
	1,129 1,432 3,173 231 5,965	1,129 3,074 1,432 288 3,173 1,254 231 378 5,965 4,994  5,512 4,550 422 401	1,129 3,074 6,134 1,432 288 360 3,173 1,254 217 231 378 1,197 5,965 4,994 7,908  5,512 4,550 4,025 422 401 3,605	1,129 3,074 6,134 476 1,432 288 360 24 3,173 1,254 217 84 231 378 1,197 63 5,965 4,994 7,908 647  5,512 4,550 4,025 551 422 401 3,605 96	1,129 3,074 6,134 476 2,339 1,432 288 360 24 168 3,173 1,254 217 84 137 231 378 1,197 63 231 5,965 4,994 7,908 647 2,875  5,512 4,550 4,025 551 2,625 422 401 3,605 96 0	1,129     3,074     6,134     476     2,339     449       1,432     288     360     24     168     128       3,173     1,254     217     84     137     0       231     378     1,197     63     231     0       5,965     4,994     7,908     647     2,875     577       5,512     4,550     4,025     551     2,625     236       422     401     3,605     96     0     341

TABLE 9

PROJECTED INTER-PADD CRUDE OIL
FLOWS IN 1990
(Thousands of barrels per day)

Receipts

hipments	PADDI	PADDII	PADD III	PADDIV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
			PIPELINE				
PADD I	0	0	45	0	0	0	45
PADD II	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	45
PADD III	0	622	0	0	0	0	0 <b>622</b>
PADD IV	0	86	0	0	0	0	86
PADD V	0	0	400	0	0	0	400
VI/PR	Ö	Ö	0	Ŏ	0	0	400
Total	0	708	445	0	0	0	1,153
			WATERBORI	NE			
PADD I	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD II	0	0	0	Ō	Ō	Ö	Ŏ
PADD III	0	69	0	0	0	Ö	69
PADD IV	0	0	0	. 0	0	0	0
PADD V	91	0	127	0	0	119	337
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	91	69	127	0	0	119	406
			TOTAL				
PADDI	0	0	45	0	0	0	45
PADD II	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD III	0	691	0	0	0	0	691
PADD IV	0	86	0	0	0	0	86
PADD V	91	0	527	0	0	119	737
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	91	777	572	0	0	119	1,559

TABLE 10

PROJECTED INTER-PADD REFINED PRODUCT
FLOWS IN 1990
(Thousands of barrels per day)

Receipts

Shipments	PADDI	PADD II	PADD III	PADDIV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
			PIPELINE				
PADDI	0	200	0	0	0	0	200
PADD II	100	0	165	84	Ö	ő	349
PADD III	2,001	706	0	0	89	Ŏ	2,796
PADD IV	0	48	0	0	48	Ö	96
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	Ö	0
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	Ō	0
Total	2,101	954	165	84	137	0	3,441
		· ·	WATERBORI	NE			
PADDI	0	222	0	0	0	0	222
PADD II	0	0	52	0	0	0	52
PADD III	731	78	0	0	0	0	809
PADD IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VI/PR	<sub>.</sub> 341	0	0	0	0	0 .	341
Total	1,072	300	52	0	0	0	1,424
		*	TOTAL				
PADD I	0	422	0	0	0	0	422
PADD II	100	0	217	84	0	0	401
PADD III	2,732	784	0	0	89	0	3,605
PADD IV	0	48	0	0	48	0	96
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VI/PR	341	0	0	0	0	0	341
Total	3,173	1,254	217	84	137	0	4,865

TABLE 11

PROJECTED U.S.-FLAG DOMESTIC
TANKER DEMAND IN 1990

		Thousands of barrels per day	Factor	Thousands of DWT	Average size of vessel	Number of vessels
Crude oil						
Alaskan Nor	rth Slope					
Valdez	– USWC – Panama – Hawaii – VI (via Cape)	1,409 247 54 90	2.20 4.63 2.67	3,100 1,141 144 _ a	124 178 73 _ a	25 6 2 – a
Puerto Ar	rmuelles – USG/PR – USEC	0 31	3.14	97	50	2
Chiriqui (	Grande – USG/PR – USEC	153 63	1.79 2.37	274 149	50 50	6 3
Total Ala	skan North Slope			4,905		44
Offshore Ca	lifornia					
	– USG – USEC	0	5.31 5.72	0 0	43 41	0 0
Refined pet	roleum product ments					
USG USWC USEC	– USEC – USWC – USEC	314	2.0	628 527 156	38 38 38	17 14 4
Total tan	ker shipments			1,311		35
Barge shipm	nents					
USG USWC USEC	– USEC – USWC – USEC	417	1.25	521 223 727	20 20 20	26 11 36
Total bar	ge shipments			1,471		73

a. Shipments to the Virgin Islands are not covered under the Jones Act; they can be carried in foreign-flag tankers.

In table 10, the waterborne trade that generates the bulk of clean-product tanker demand is from PADD III (Gulf Coast refineries) to PADD I (the East Coast). About 58 percent of these shipments are expected to move by barge, however, not by tanker. Waterborne carriage from PADD I to PADD II, from PADD II to PADD III, and from PADD III to PADD III is in small inland vessels. Trade from the Virgin Islands (VI) and Puerto Rico (PR) to PADD I (the East Coast) is expected to generate only modest amounts of business for U.S.-flag tankers, because the Virgin Islands is exempt from the Jones Act. Some trade between the Virgin Islands and the East Coast has moved in U.S.-flag tankers, but it is vulnerable to foreign competition. Puerto Rico is under the Jones Act, but over 85 percent of the projected shipments from VI/PR are out of the Virgin Islands.

It is noteworthy that projected shipments of refined product from PADD III to PADD I total about 2.7 million barrels per day in 1990, and that about 2.0 million barrels are projected to be carried in pipelines. Had the transgulf pipeline project materialized, pipeline shipments would have risen by 350,000 barrels per day.

Volumes of oil projected to be carried by tankers are converted into projected demands for tanker tonnage and for numbers of tankers in table 11. For crude oil, the trade routes shown in column 1 include both shipments from PADD V to PADD III and shipments to destinations within PADD V. Despite sizable increases in the production of offshore California oil by 1990, no tanker demand is generated from it because it is allocated to the All American pipeline.

Oil flows in thousands of barrels per day are converted into tanker tonnage demand in thousands of DWT by means of tonnage factors. These factors differ for each route primarily because more tanker capacity is needed to maintain a given flow of oil if a trade route is longer. Tanker tonnage demands are converted into projected numbers of tankers by dividing by average vessel sizes. In this way, 44 crude-carrying tankers with a total capacity of 4.9 million DWT are projected to be commercially viable in 1990. This projection was shown in table 4, and in table 5 it was reported that only 16 of the 44 tankers were considered to be militarily useful. That estimate was obtained by adding the crude-carrying tankers projected to operate on routes characterized by vessels small enough to have military utility.

In addition, although the average vessel size on the route from Valdez to the U.S. West Coast is 124,000 DWT, and the upper limit for a militarily

. useful vessel is in the 80,000- to 90,000-DWT range, a few smaller vessels are expected to survive on that route as shown in table 12.

TABLE 12
.
MILITARILY USEFUL TANKERS IN THE CRUDE TRADES IN 1990

*	Number
- USEC	. 2
<ul><li>USG/PR</li><li>USEC</li></ul>	6 3
– Hawaii – USWC	2 3
	16
	<ul><li>USG/PR</li><li>USEC</li><li>Hawaii</li></ul>

The demand for clean-product tankers is projected similarly, but with a few additions. Waterborne shipments of refined products from the Gulf (USG) to the East Coast (USEC) are divided among tankers and barges, with a 58-percent share projected for barges. Both barges and tankers also carry refined products along the East and West Coasts. Estimates for the intracoastal trades could not be made on the basis of volumes of shipments. Rather, projections of active tanker and barge tonnage in these trades were based on National Petroleum Council estimates of 1983 activity. The 1983 tonnage was indexed to the projections of refined product consumption in East and West Coast markets for 1990 and later years. The projection of tankers operating along the East Coast in 1990 includes a few tankers in the trade from the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico to the East Coast.

### PROJECTIONS FOR 1995

A major finding of the study is that the U.S.-flag commercial tanker fleet is expected to decline to its lowest point by 1995, as shown in tables 4 and 5. The portion of the fleet engaged in international carriage—the CDS component—is projected to shrink because subsidy payments will expire; tankers in the domestic trades will continue to diminish in number because of reduced domestic crude oil production. The gap between domestic refined product production and domestic crude production is filled with crude oil imports, carried mainly on foreign-flag ships. In addition, sizable gains in

imports of refined products are anticipated as domestic refineries continue to lose their competitive edge. To the extent that increases in refined product consumption are met by refined product imports, the number of clean-product tankers in the U.S.-flag fleet is smaller than it would have been if domestic refining activity had been greater. The projected relationships between production, imports, and consumption are shown in table 13.

TABLE 13

OIL MARKET PROJECTIONS: AN OVERVIEW

(Thousands of barrels per day)

	1990	1995	2000
Crude oil production (Alaskan North Slope)	7,600 1,800	5,500 1,200	7,000 1,500
Crude oil imports	6,00 <b>0</b>	8,500	7,000
Refined product production	13,600	14,000	14,000
Refined product imports	2,400	3,910	4,590
Consumption	17,500	19,600	20,380

The detailed projections of oil flows and their translation into projections of Jones Act tankers are displayed in tables 14 through 18. Earlier it was observed that the demand for Jones Act crude-carrying tankers is derived entirely from shipments of crude oil within PADD V and from PADD V to other PADDs. By 1995, shipments from PADD V are projected to be 103,000 barrels per day, down from 737,000 in 1990 (see table 14). The reason is that the declines in domestic crude output are filled by additional imports directly to East and Gulf Coast refineries, not to the West Coast. Production in Alaska and California is fed to local (PADD V) refineries. As a result, shipments of crude oil through the Panama Canal dry up; the little PADD V crude that is shipped east is sent via pipeline. This projected pattern of shipments can be seen in table 16, and the derivation of crude-carrying Jones Act tankers is shown in table 18. From 1990 to 1995 that segment of the fleet is expected to decline from 44 vessels down to 23. In contrast, projected numbers of refined-product tankers change little from what they were in 1990. As noted earlier, once crude is refined on the Gulf Coast, it must be shipped in U.S.-flag tankers or barges or by pipeline. The source of the crude - domestic or foreign - makes no difference. The only loss to the cleanproduct fleet is an "opportunity loss." With greater domestic refinery capability, the number of clean-product tankers would have grown.

TABLE 14

PROJECTED CRUDE OIL
FLOWS IN 1995
(Thousands of barrels per day)

	PADD I	PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
Sources			٠.				
Crude oil production Crude oil imports Receipts from other	55 1,147	495 2,244	2,365 4,230	440 50	2,145 366	0 462	5,500 <b>8,5</b> 00
PADDS	0	425	143	_0	0	0	
Total crude supply	1,202	3,164	6,738	490	2,511	462	
Uses							
Crude runs Shipments to other	1,162	3,164	6,314	490	2,408	462	14,000
PADDS	40	0	424	0	103	0	
Crude oil exports	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE 15

PROJECTED REFINED PRODUCT
FLOWS IN 1995
(Thousands of barrels per day)

	PADD I	PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
Sources							
Refined product							
production	1,162	3,164	6,314	490	2,408	462	14,000
Refined product							
imports	2,378	469	587	39	274	164	3,910
Receipts from other							
PADDS	3,241	1,521	232	90	255	0	
Other product supply	<u>253</u>	414	<u>1,311</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>253</u>	0	2,300
Total product supply	7,034	5,568	8,443	688	3,190	626	20,210
Uses							
Refined product consumption	6,174	5,096	4,508	617	2,940	265	19,600
Shipments to other							
PADDS	829	429	3,648	71	0	361	
Product exports	31	43	287	0	250	0	610

PROJECTED INTER-PADD CRUDE OIL FLOWS IN 1995
(Thousands of barrels per day)

Receipts

Shipments	PADDI	PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
			PIPELINE				
PADDI	0	0		•		_	
PADD II	0 0	0 0	40	0	0	0	40
PADD III	0	382	0 0	0 0	0	0	0
PADD IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	382
PADD V	0	0	103	0	0	0 0	0
VI/PR	ő	0	0	0	0	0	103 0
Total	0	382	143	0	0	0	525
		•	WATERBORI	NE			
PADD I	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD II	0	0	0	Ō	Ö	Ö	0
PADD III	0	42	0	0	Ö	Ö	42
PADD IV	0	0	0	0	0	Ö	0
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	42	0	0	0	. 0	42
			TOTAL				
PADD I	. 0	0	40	0	0	0	40
PADDII	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	40
PADD III	0	424	0	0	0	0	0 4 <b>2</b> 4
PADD IV	Ö	0	0	0	0	0	424
PADD V	Ō	Ö	103	0	0	0	103
VI/PR	0	0	0	Ö	ŏ	ō	0
Total	0	424	143	0	0	0	567

TABLE 17

PROJECTED INTER-PADD REFINED PRODUCT
FLOWS IN 1995
(Thousands of barrels per day)

Receipts

Shipments	PADDI	PADDII	PADD III	PADDIV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
			PIPELINE				
PADD I	0	564	0	0	0	0	564
PADD II	107	0	176	90	0	0	373
PADD III	2,035	590	0	0	220	0	2,845
PADD IV	. 0	35	Ō	0	35	0	70
PADD V	0	0	0	Ö	0	Ö	0
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	ō	Ö
Total	2,142	1,189	176	90	255	0	3,852
			WATERBOR	NE			
PADD I	0	265	0	0	0	0	. 265
PADD II	0	0	56	0	Ö	Ö	56
PADD III	730 -	66	0	0	0	0	804
PADD IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VI/PR	361	0	0	0	0	0	361
Total	1,099	331	56	0	0	0	1,486
			TOTAL				
PADD I	0			•	•	•	
PADD II	0 107	829 0	0 232	0	0	0	829
PADD III	2,773	656	232 0	90 0	0	0	429
PADD IV	2,773	35	0	0	220 35	0	3,649
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	70
VI/PR	361	0	0	0	0	0	0 361
Total	3,241	1,520	232	90	255	0	5,338

TABLE 18

PROJECTED U.S.-FLAG DOMESTIC
TANKER DEMAND IN 1995

•		Thousands of barrels per day	Factor	Thousands of DWT	Average size of vessel	Number of vessels
Crude Oil						
Alaskan Noi	rth Slope					
Valdez	– USWC – Panama – Hawaii – VI (via Cape)	1,1 <b>6</b> 3 0 36 0	2.20 4.63 2.67 _ a	2,558 0 96 — a	124 178 73 _ <sup>a</sup>	21 0 2 _ a
Puerto Ai						
	– USG/PR – USEC	0 0	3.14	0	50	0 0
Chiriqui (	Grande – USG/PR – USEC	0	1.79 2.37	0	50 50	0
Total Ala	skan North Slope			2,654		23
Offshore Ca	lifornia					
	– USG – USEC	0	5.31 5.72	0	43 41	0 0
Refined-pet	roleum product					
Tanker ship	ments					
USG USWC USEC	– USEC – USWC – USEC	314	2.0	628 590 174	38 38 38	17 16 5
Total tan	ker shipments			1,392		38
Barge shipm	ients					
USG USWC USEC	– USEC – USWC – USEC	416	1.25	520 250 814	20 20 20	26 13 41
Total bar	ge shipments			1,584		80

a. Shipments to the Virgin Islands are not covered under the Jones Act; they can be carried in foreign-flag tankers.

An important qualification is that the unit cost of shipments through the All American pipeline might be driven sufficiently high when volumes are in the range of 100,000 barrels per day so that it would be uneconomical to use it. If so, a small volume of crude—103,000 barrels per day—might move by tanker to the Gulf Coast rather than by pipeline. The Valdez-to-Panama carriage would sustain three additional large crude carriers, and the Chiriqui Grande-to-Gulf Coast movement would sustain another four militarily useful ships. Should this occur, the tanker shortfall in 1995 would be a little lower than the projections in tables 1 and 3 indicate. Specifically, available militarily useful tonnage would be higher by 184,000 DWT, or seven HSTEs. Given the bleak outlook for oil production in Alaska and the West Coast, the wisdom of proceeding with the All American pipeline appears dubious. Nonetheless, the project is moving ahead.

# PROJECTIONS FOR 2000 AND 2010

After declining to a low in 1995, the U.S.-flag commercial fleet is projected to recover somewhat by 2000. The CDS fleet continues to shrink as ODS contracts expire, but these declines are more than offset by moderate growth of the Jones Act fleet in conjunction with higher levels of domestic crude oil production (see table 13). The rationale for this reversal is that low oil prices encourage consumption, but they discourage the exploration, drilling, and development needed to enhance domestic supply. In the short run, it is cheaper to import; but in the longer run, world demand grows faster than world supply. Prices recover, providing renewed incentives to find and develop domestic fields.

The tanker projections for 2000 are shown in tables 4 and 5. Although the tanker fleet as a whole grows a little between 1995 and 2000, the militarily useful component of it remains unchanged. Higher domestic crude oil output creates a market for additional crude carriers that are likely to be too large to have much military value. By 2010, domestic oil output is projected to have turned down again, and the militarily useful tanker fleet will decrease a little as well. Thus, the bottom line for the Navy is that the militarily useful part of the tanker fleet will hit bottom around 1995, with about 70 tankers with a total capacity of almost 3 million DWT. This count is the sum of the 51 tankers projected to remain in the commercial fleet (shown in table 5) and 19 MSC tankers. Sets of tables for the projections for 2000 and 2010 are provided in the appendix.

# **ALTERNATIVE SCENARIOS**

The projections reported above are those deemed most likely to occur and are denoted as the control projection. The same methodology can be employed to generate alternative projections, and in that way gauge the sensitivity of the results. Two alternatives are summarized here, one for the case of substantially higher crude oil production, and the other for the case where exports of Alaskan crude oil are permitted.

The effect of higher crude oil production, possibly stemming from stronger-than-anticipated oil prices, is shown in table 19. The tanker shortfall is the difference between tanker requirements for military support – 7,416,000 DWT – and the sum of the projected tonnage in the MSC, U.S. commercial, and EUSC militarily useful tanker fleets. Thus, the tanker shortfall represents the size requirement for the tanker portion of the RRF. Although the effect of stronger production is to lessen the RRF requirement, even under these highly optimistic circumstances, by 1995 the RRF tanker fleet would have to be about double the size DOD currently has programmed for 1990. A full set of tables for this alternative projection is also in the appendix.

TABLE 19
SENSITIVITY OF THE TANKER SHORTFALL
TO DOMESTIC CRUDE OIL PRODUCTION

Alternative case		Contro	rol case	
1990	1995	1990	1995	
8,800	7,800	7,600	5,500	
1,800	1,700	1,800	1,200	
5,255	4,831	4,554	3,864	
2,161	2,585	2,862	3,552	
79	94	104	129	
	1990 8,800 1,800 5,255 2,161	1990 1995  8,800 7,800 , 1,800 1,700  5,255 4,831  2,161 2,585	1990     1995     1990       8,800     7,800     7,600       1,800     1,700     1,800       5,255     4,831     4,554       2,161     2,585     2,862	

a. The sum of the MSC, U.S. commercial, and EUSC available militarily useful tankers.

b. Tanker requirements for military support (7,416) less militarily useful tanker tonnage in line 3.

The other alternative, the Alaskan export scenario, is summarized in table 20. The assumption is that 200,000 barrels per day of Alaskan crude oil are exported to Japan. Under current maritime policy, those shipments would not fall under the Jones Act, and in all probability would be carried in foreign-flag tankers. In this scenario, the crude oil sent to Japan is replaced by increased imports to the Gulf and East Coasts. About 14 tankers would be displaced in 1990, but only 9 would be small enough to be militarily useful. In 1995, a displacement of 5 militarily useful tankers would occur, because Alaskan production is projected to be too low to warrant exporting 200,000 barrels per day. Only about half that amount might be exported. The details of this scenario are reported in tables in the appendix.

TABLE 20

ALASKAN EXPORT SCENARIO

U.S.-flag tanker capacity displaced

1990		1995	
Tankers	DWT	Tankers	DWT
14	1,361	0	0
5	926	3	0
9	435	5	0
. 9	435	5	0
	Tankers  14 5 9	Tankers DWT  14 1,361 5 926 9 435	Tankers         DWT         Tankers           14         1,361         0           5         926         3           9         435         5

# REFERENCES

- [1] Department of Defense, Office of the Director, Program Appraisal and Evaluation, DOD Sealift Tanker Study (U), Secret, Jul 1985
- [2] Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration, Economic Support Shipping, Unclassified, Apr 1985
- [3] CNA, Research Contribution 539, A Methodology for Projecting U.S.-Flag Commercial Tanker Capacity, by Ronald F. Rost, Unclassified, Mar 1986

# APPENDIX PROJECTION TABLES

## **APPENDIX**

## PROJECTION TABLES

This appendix provides additional projection tables for oil flows for the future. Included are the following:

	Pages
• Control Projections for 2000	A-2-A-5
• Control Projections for 2010	A-6-A-9
• High Production Alternatives for 1990	A-10 – A-13
• High Production Alternatives for 1995	A-14 – A-17
<ul> <li>Alaskan Export Alternatives for 1990</li> </ul>	A-18 – A-20
<ul> <li>Alaskan Export Alternatives for 1995</li> </ul>	A-21 - A-23

PROJECTED CRUDE
OIL FLOWS IN 2000
(Thousands of barrels per day)

	PADDI	PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
Sources							
Crude oil production	70	630	2,870	630	2,800	0	7,000
Crude oil imports Receipts from other	1,044	1,848	3,383	42	302	381	7,000
PADDS	88	<u>686</u>	<u>_565</u>	0	0	81	
Total crude supply	1,202	3,164	6,818	672	3,102	462	14,000
Uses							
Crude runs Shipments to other	1,162	3,164	6,314	490	2,408	462	14,000
PADDS	40	0	504	182	694	0	
Crude oil exports	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE A-2

PROJECTED REFINED PRODUCT
FLOWS IN 2000
(Thousands of barrels per day)

	PADDI	PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
Sources							_
Refined product production Refined product	1,162	3,164	6,314	490	2,408	462	14,000
imports Receipts from other	2,792	551	689	46	321	191	4,590
PADDS Other product supply	3,254 <u>264</u>	1,641 432	241 <u>1,368</u>	94 72	314 264	0	2,400
Total product supply	7,472	5,788	8,611	702	3,307	653	20,990
Uses							
Refined product consumption	6,420	5,299	4,687	642	3,057	275	20,380
Shipments to other PADDS Product exports	1,022 31	446 43	3,637 287	60 0	0 250	378 0	610

TABLE A-3

PROJECTED INTER-PADD

CRUDE OIL FLOWS IN 2000

(Thousands of barrels per day)

Shipments	PADDI	PADDII	PADDIII	PADDIV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
			PIPELINE				
PADD I	0	0	40	0	0	0	40
PADD II	Ŏ	Ŏ	0	Ŏ	0	0	0
PADD III	. 0	454	0	Ö	Ö	Ö	454
PADD IV	0	182	Ŏ	Ŏ	ő	Ŏ	182
PADD V	Ŏ	0	400	Ŏ	Ö	0	400
VI/PR	0	Ö	0	Ö	ŏ	ő	0
Total	0	636	440	0	0	0	1,076
			WATERBORI	NE			
PADD I	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD II	Ö	Ŏ	Ŏ	ő	Ö	0	0
PADD III	Ö	50	Ö	Ŏ	Ŏ	Ŏ	50
PADD IV	Ō	0	Ō	Ŏ	Ö	Ŏ	0
PADD V	88	0	124	Ō	Ö	81	293
VI/PR	0	0	0	Ö	Ō	0	0
Total	88	50	124	0	0	81	343
			TOTAL				
PADDI	0	0	40	0	0	0	40
PADD II	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD III	0	504	0	0	0	0	504
PADD IV	0	182	0	0	0	0	182
PADD V	88	0	524	0	0	81	693
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	88	686	564	0	0	81	1,419

TABLE A-4

PROJECTED INTER-PADD REFINED PRODUCT
FLOWS IN 2000
(Thousands of barrels per day)

Shipments	PADDI	PADDII	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Tota
			PIPELINE				
PADD I	0	695	0	0	0	0	695
PADD II	111	0	183	94	0	0	388
PADD III	2,027	530	0	0	284	0	2,841
PADD IV	0	30	0	0	30	0	60
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ċ
Total	2,138	1,255	183	94	314	0	3,984
			WATERBOR	NE			
PADD I	0	327	0	0	0	- 0	327
PADD II	0	0	58	0	Ö	Ö	58
PADD III	737	59	0	0	0	Ö	796
PADD IV	0	0	0	0	Ō	Ö	, , ,
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	0	Č
VI/PR	378	0	0	0	0	0	378
Total	1,115	386	58	0	0	0	1,559
			TOTAL				
PADD I	0	1,022	0	0	0	0	1,022
PADD II	111	0	241	94	0	0	446
PADD III	2,764	589	0	0	284	0	3,637
PADD IV	0	30	0	0	30	0	60
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VI/PR	378	0	0	0	0	0	378
Total	3,253	1,641	241	94	314	0	5,543

TABLE A-5
PROJECTED U.S.-FLAG DOMESTIC
TANKER DEMAND IN 2000

		Thousands of barrels per day	Factor	Thousands of DWT	Average size of vessel	Number of vessels
Crude oil				8		
Alaskan Noi	rth Slope					
Valdez	– USWC – Panama – Hawaii – VI (via Cape)	1,161 232 45 62	2.20 4.63 2.67 _ a	2,555 1,074 120 _ a	124 178 73	21 6 2 _ a
Puerto Ar	rmuelles – USG/PR – USEC	0 <b>29</b>	0 3.14	0 91	50 50	0 2
Chiriqui (	Grande – USG/PR – USEC	144 59	1.79 2.37	257 140	50 50	5 3
Total Ala	skan North Slope			4,237		39
Offshore Ca	lifornia					
	– USG – USEC	0	5.31 5.72	0 0	43 41	0
Refined pet	roleum product					
Tanker ship	ments					
USG USWC USEC	– USEC – USWC – USEC	317	2.0	634 614 <u>181</u>	38 38 38	17 16 5
Total tan	ker shipments			1,429		38
Barge shipm	nents					
USG USWC USEC	– USEC – USWC – USEC	420	1.25	525 260 <u>846</u>	20 20 20	26 13 42
Total bar	ge shipments			1,631		81

a. Shipments to the Virgin Islands are not covered under the Jones Act; they can be carried in foreign-flag tankers.

TABLE A-6

PROJECTED CRUDE
OIL FLOWS IN 2010
(Thousands of barrels per day)

	PADDI	PADDII	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
Sources							
Crude oil production	60	540	2,340	540	2,520	0	6,000
Crude oil imports Receipts from other	1,052	2,112	3,981	48	345	462	8,000
PADDS	90	512	407	0	0	0	
Total crude supply	1,202	3,164	6,728	588	2,865	462	14,000
Uses							
Crude runs Shipments to other	1,162	3,164	6,314	490	2,408	462	14,000
PADDS	40	0	414	98	457	0	
Crude oil exports	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE A-7

PROJECTED REFINED PRODUCT
FLOWS IN 2010
(Thousands of barrels per day)

	PADDI	PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
Sources						- "	
Refined product production	1,162	3,164	6,314	490	2,408	462	14,000
Refined product	1		•	,50	2,400	402	14,000
imports Receipts from other	3,831	751	939	63	438	238	6,260
PADDS	3,200	1,910	260	101	447	0	
Other product supply	<u> 264</u>	_432	<u>1,368</u>	<u>_72</u>	_ 264	0	2,400
Total product supply	8,457	6,257	8,881	726	3,558	700	22,660
Uses							
Refined product consumption	6,946	5,733	5,071	695	3,308	298	22,050
Shipments to other	4 400	404					
PADDS Product exports	1,480 31	481 43	3,523 287	31 0	0 250	403 0	610

TABLE A-8

PROJECTED INTER-PADD

CRUDE OIL FLOWS IN 2010

(Thousands of barrels per day)

Shipments	PADDI	PADDII	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Tota
			PIPELINF,				
DADDI	^	0					
PADD II	0	0	40	0	0	0	40
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD III	0	373	0	0	0	0	373
PADD IV	0	98	0	0	0	0	98
PADD V	0	0	367	0	0	0	367
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	_						
Total	0	471	407	0	0	0	878
		,	WATERBOR	NE			
PADDI	0	0	0	0	0	0	. 0
PADD II	0	0	Ō	Ö	Ö	0	. 0
PADD III	0	41	,0	Ö	Ö	0	41
PADD IV	0	0	0	Ŏ	ő	0	0
PADD V	90	0	Ö	Ö	Ŏ	0	90
VI/PR	0	0	0	Ö	Ö	Ö	0
T otal	90	41	0	0	0	0	131
			TOTAL				
PADD I	^			•	•		16.2
PADD II	0	0	40	0	0	0	40
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD III	0	414	0	0	0	0	414
PADD IV	0	98	0	0	0	0	98
PADD V	90	0	367	0	0	0	457
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	90	512	407	0	0	0	1,009

PROJECTED INTER-PADD REFINED PRODUCT
FLOWS IN 2010
(Thousands of barrels per day)

				<u>.</u>			
Shipments	PADDI	PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
		8	PIPELINE				
PADDI	0	474	0	0	0	0	474
PADDII	120	0	197	101	0	0	418
PADDIII	1,952	372	0	0	431	Ö	2,755
PADD IV	0	16	Ö	Ö	16	Ŏ	32
PADD V	Ō	0	0	Ö	0	Ŏ	0
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	ő	ŏ	0
Total	2,072	862	197	101	447	0	3,679
		*	WATERBOR	NE			
PADD I	0	1,007	0	0	0	0	1,007
PADD II	Ö	0	62	Ö	0	ő	62
PADD III	725	41	0	Ō	Ö	Ö	766
PADD IV	0	0	Ō	Ō	Ö	Ö	0
PADD V	0	0	0	0	Ō	Ö	Ö
VI/PR	403	0	0	0	0	0	403
Total	1,128	1,048	62	0	0	0 .	2,238
		<b>II</b> .	TOTAL				
PADD I	. 0	1,480	0	0	0	0	1,408
PADD II	120	0	260	101	0	Ō	481
PADD III	2,677	414	0	0	432	0	3,523
PADD IV	0	16	0	0	15	0	31
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VI/PR	403	0	0	0	0	0	403
Total	3,200	1,910	260	101	447	0	5,918

TABLE A-10

PROJECTED U.S.-FLAG DOMESTIC TANKER DEMAND IN 2010

		Thousands of barrels per day	Factor	Thousands of DWT	Average size of vessel	Number of vessels
Crude oil						
Alaskan Nor	th Slope					
	11611/6					
Valdez	– USWC	1,656	2.20	3,643	124	30
	– Panama – Hawaii	90	4.63	417	178	2
		54	2.67 _ a	144 _ a	73 _ a	2
	– VI (via Cape)	0	_ ~		_ "	_ a
Puerto Ar	muelles					
	<ul><li>USG/PR</li></ul>	0	2.43	0	50	0
	– USEC	30	3.14	94	50	2
Chiriqui G	irande		,			
3	– USG/PR	0	1.79	0	50	0
	– USEC	60	2.37	142	50	3
				172	30	3
Total Alas	skan North Slope			4,440		39
Offshore Cal	lifornia					
	– USG	0	5.31	0	43	0
	– USEC	Ö	5.72	ŏ	41	0
Refined petr	oleum product					
Tanker shipr	ments					
USG	– USEC	· 312	2.0	624	38	16
USWC	– USWC			664	38	18
USEC	- USEC			196	38	5
Total tank	cer shipments			1,484		39
Barge shipm	ents					
USG	– USEC	413	1.25	516	20	26
USW	– USWC	713	1.23	282	. 20	14
USE	– USEC			916	20	46
	ge shipments			1,714		86

 $<sup>\</sup>textbf{a. Shipments to the Virgin Islands are not covered under the Jones Act; they can be carried in foreign-flag tankers.}\\$ 

TABLE A-11

HIGH PRODUCTION ALTERNATIVE FOR CRUDE OIL FLOWS IN 1990 (Thousands of barrels per day)

	PADD	PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
Sources							
Crude oil production Crude oil imports Receipts from other	88 839	880 1,280	3,960 2,361	616 25	3,256 220	0 275	8,800 5,000
PADDS	<u>263</u>	<u>* 959</u>	704	0	0	<u>180</u>	
Total crude supply	1,190	3,119	7,025	641	3,476	455	13,800
Uses ·							
Crude runs Shipments to other	1,145	3,119	6,224	483	2,374	455	13,800
PADDS Crude oil exports	<b>45</b> 0	0 0	801 0	158 0	1,102 0	0	0

TABLE A-12
HIGH PRODUCTION ALTERNATIVE FOR REFINED PRODUCT FLOWS IN 1990 (Thousands of barrels per day)

	PADDI	PADD II	PADD III	PADDIV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
Sources							
Refined product							
production	1,145	3,119	6,224	483	2,374	455	13,800
Refined product							
imports	928	192	240	16	112	112	1,600
Receipts from other PADDS	2 250	1 140	217	0.4		•	
Other product supply	3,258 231	1,148 378	1,197	84 62	64	0	2 100
		_3/6	1,137	<u>63</u>	<u>231</u>	0	2,100
Total product supply	5,562	4,837	7,877	646	2,781	567	17,500
Uses							
Refined product consumption	5,323	4,394	3,887	. 532	2,535	228	16,900
Shipments to other							
PADDS	209	401	3,708	114	0	339	
Product exports	30	402	282	0	246	0	600
<del></del>							

TABLE A-13

HIGH PRODUCTION ALTERNATIVE FOR INTER-PADD
CRUDE OIL FLOWS IN 1990
(Thousands of barrels per day)

Shipments	PADDI	D. A. D. D					
<del>~~~</del>		PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
			PIPELINE				
PADDI	0	0	45	0	0	0	45
PADD II	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD III	0	721	0	0	0	0	721
PADD IV	0	158	0	0	0	0	158
PADD V	0	0	400	0 .	0	0	400
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	. 0	879	445	0	0	0	1,324
		,	WATERBORI	NE			
PADD I	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD II	0	0	0	0	Ō	Ō	Ö
PADD III	0	80	0	0	0	0	80
PADD IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD V	263	0	259	0	0	180	702
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	263	80	259	0	0	180	782
			TOTAL				
PADDI	0	0	45	0	0	0	45
PADD II	0	Ö	0	Ö	Ö	0	0
PADD III	0	801	0	Ö	Ö	0	801
PADD IV	0	158	0	0	0	Ö	158
PADD V	263	0	659	0	0	180	1,102
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	263	959	704	0	0	180	2,106

TABLE A-14

HIGH PRODUCTION ALTERNATIVE FOR REFINED PRODUCT FLOWS IN 1990 (Thousands of barrels per day)

Shipments	PADDI	PADDII	PADD III	PADDIV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
			PIPELINE				
PADD I	0	142	0	0	0	•	4.40
PADDII	100	0	165	84	0 0	0	142
PADD III	2,074	794	0	0	7	0	349
PADD IV	2,074	57	0	0	7 57	0	2,875
PADD V	0	0	0	0		0	114
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VITT	U	U	U	U	U	0	0
Total	2,174	993	165	84	64	0	3,480
			WATERBORI	NE			
PADD I	0	67	0	0	0	0	67
PADD II	0	0	52	Ō	Ö	Ö	52
PADD III	744	88	0	0	Ö	ŏ	832
PADD IV	0	0	0	0	0	Ö	0
PADD V	0	0	0	Ö	0	Ö	Ö
VI/PR	339	0	0	Ō	Ö.	. 0	339
Total	1,083	155	52	0	0	0	1,290
			TOTAL				
PADD I	0	209	0	0	0	0	209
PADD II	100	0	217	84	Ŏ	Ö	401
PADD III	2,818	882	0	0	7	Ö	3,707
PADD IV	. 0	57	Ö	Ö	57	Ö	114
PADD V	Ō	0	Ö	Ö	0	Ö	0
VI/PR	339	0	Ö	Ö	Ö	0	339
Total	3,257	1,148	217	84	64	0	4,770

TABLE A-15
HIGH PRODUCTION ALTERNATIVE FOR U.S.-FLAG
DOMESTIC TANKER DEMAND IN 1990

		Thousands of barrels per day	Factor	Thousands of DWT	Average size of vessel	Number of vessels
Crude oil						
Alaskan No	rth Slope					
Valdez	– USWC – Panama – Hawaii – VI (via Cape)	1,044 565 54 137	2.20 4.63 2.67	2,296 2,617 144 _ <sup>a</sup>	124 178 73 _ a	19 15 2 _ a
Puerto A	rmuelles					
	– USG/PR – USEC	0 87	3.14	0 <b>2</b> 73	50 50	0 6
Chiriqui (	Grande					
	– USG/PR – USEC	302 176	1.79 2.37	540 418	50 50	11 8
Total Ala	skan North Sl <b>o</b> pe			6,288		61
Offshore Ca	lifornia	l				
	– USG – USEC	0 0	5.31 5.72	0 0	43 41	. 0
Refined pet	roleum product					
Tanker ship	ments					
USG USWC USEC	– USEC – USWC – USEC	320	2.0	640 509 150	38 38 38	17 14 _4
Total tan	ker shipments			1,299		35
Barge shipm	ients					
USG USWC USEC	– USEC – USWC – USEC	424	1.25	530 216 702	20 20 20	27 11 <u>35</u>
Total bar	ge shipments			1,448		73

a. Shipments to the Virgin Islands are not covered under the Jones Act; they can be carried in foreign-flag tankers.

TABLE A-16

HIGH PRODUCTION ALTERNATIVE FOR CRUDE OIL FLOWS IN 1995 (Thousands of barrels per day)

	PADDI	PADD II	PADD III	<b>PADD IV</b>	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
Sources			Y				
Crude oil production Crude oil imports Receipts from other	78 809	702 1,584	3,354 2,986	624 36	3,042 259	0 <b>326</b>	7,800 6,000
PADDS	_298	<u>833</u>	_540	0	0	129	
Total crude supply	1,185	3,119	6,880	660	3,301	455	13,800
Uses							
Crude runs Shipments to other	1,145	3,119	6,224	483	2,374	455	13,800
PADDS	40	0	65 <b>6</b>	177	927	0	
Crude oil exports	. 0	0	0	0	0	Ö	0

TABLE A-17
HIGH PRODUCTION ALTERNATIVE FOR REFINED PRODUCT FLOWS IN 1995
(Thousands of barrels per day)

	PADDI	PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
Sources			`				
Refined product							
production	1,145	3,119	6,224	483	2,374	455	13,800
Refined product imports	870	190	225	1 =	405	405	4 = 0.0
Receipts from other	870	180	225	15	105	105	1,500
PADDS	3,298	1,171	232	90	64	0	
Other product supply	242	<u>396</u>	1,254	<u>66</u>	_242	0	2,200
Total product supply	5,555	4,866	7,934	654	2,785	560	17,500
Uses							
Refined product consumption	5,323	4,394	3,887	532	2,535	218	16,890
Shipments to other PADDS	201	420	2.764	400			
Product exports	201 31	429 43	3,761 287	122 0	0 250	342 0	610
					230		010

TABLE A-18

HIGH PRODUCTION ALTERNATIVE FOR INTER-PADD
CRUDE OIL FLOWS IN 1995
(Thousands of barrels per day)

Padd   Padd								
PADD I	Shipments	PADDI	PADDII	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
PADD I				DIDELINE				
PADD II				PIPELINE				
PADD III			0	40	0	0	0	40
PADD IV 0 177 0 0 0 0 177 PADD V 0 0 400 0 0 0 0 400 VI/PR 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0  Total 0 767 440 0 0 0 0 1,207  WATERBORNE  PADD II 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PADD III 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PADD IV 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PADD IV 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PADD V 298 0 100 0 0 129 527 VI/PR 0 0 0 40 0 0 0 129 593  TOTAL  PADD I 0 0 40 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0								0
PADD V								
VI/PR					-			
Total 0 767 440 0 0 0 1,207  WATERBORNE  PADD I 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PADD II 0 0 666 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0								
WATERBORNE	VI/PR	U	U	Ü	U	0	0	0
PADD I	Total	0	767	440	0	0	0	1,207
PADD II 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				WATERBORI	NE			
PADD II 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	PADD I	0	0	n	0		. 0	0
PADD III 0 66 0 0 0 0 0 66 PADD IV 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PADD V 298 0 100 0 0 129 527 VI/PR 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 129 593  TOTAL  PADD I 0 0 40 0 0 0 0 0 PADD II 0 0 40 0 0 0 0 0 PADD II 0 656 0 0 0 0 656 PADD IV 0 177 0 0 0 0 177 PADD V 298 0 500 0 0 129 927 VI/PR 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0								
PADD IV 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PADD V 298 0 100 0 0 129 527 VI/PR 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 129 527 VI/PR 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 129 593 TOTAL  PADD I 0 0 40 0 0 0 40 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	PADD III							
PADD V 298 0 100 0 0 129 527 VI/PR 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	PADD IV	0	0	0	0			
Total 298 66 100 0 0 129 593  TOTAL  PADD I 0 0 40 0 0 0 40  PADD II 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0  PADD III 0 0 656 0 0 0 0 0 656  PADD IV 0 177 0 0 0 0 0 177  PADD V 298 0 500 0 0 129 927  VI/PR 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				100	0	0	129	
TOTAL  PADD I 0 0 40 0 0 0 40  PADD II 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0  PADD III 0 656 0 0 0 0 0 656  PADD IV 0 177 0 0 0 0 0 177  PADD V 298 0 500 0 0 129 927  VI/PR 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD I         0         0         40         0         0         0         40           PADD II         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         0         656         PADD IV         0         0         0         0         0         0         177         0         0         0         0         0         177         0         0         0         0         0         177         0	Total	298	66	100	0	0	129	593
PADD II 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PADD III 0 656 0 0 0 0 0 656 PADD IV 0 177 0 0 0 0 129 927 VI/PR 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				TOTAL				
PADD II 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 PADD III 0 656 0 0 0 0 0 656 PADD IV 0 177 0 0 0 0 129 927 VI/PR 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	PADD I	0	0	40	n	0	0	40
PADD III 0 656 0 0 0 0 656 PADD IV 0 177 0 0 0 0 177 PADD V 298 0 500 0 0 129 927 VI/PR 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0								_
PADD IV 0 177 0 0 0 0 177 PADD V 298 0 500 0 0 129 927 VI/PR 0 0 0 0 0 0 0								_
PADD.V 298 0 500 0 0 129 927 VI/PR 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		_	177					
				500		0	129	
Total 298 833 540 0 0 129 1,800	VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	298	833	540	0	0	129	1,800

TABLE A-19

HIGH PRODUCTION ALTERNATIVE FOR INTER-PADD REFINED PRODUCT FLOWS IN 1995 (Thousands of barrels per day)

Shipments	PADD I	PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
			PIPELINE				
PADD I	0	137	0	•	•	•	
PADD II	107	0	0 176	0 90	0	0	137
PADD III	2,099	818	0	90	、 0 4	0	373
PADD IV	2,099	61	0	0	61	0 0	2,921
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
VI/PR	Ö	Ö	0	0	0	0	0 0
Total	2 205	1.016	476		- 4	_	
Total	2,206	1,016	176	90	65	0	3,553
			WATERBOR	NE			
PADDI	0	64	0	0	0	0	64
PADDII	0	0	56	0	. 0	0 0	64 56
PADD III	749	91	0	0	0	0	840
PADD IV	0	0	ő	Ö	0	0	0
PADD V	0	0	Ö	ő	Ŏ	0	0
VI/PR	342	0	0	0	0	Ö	342
Total	1,091	155	56	0	0	0	1,302
			TOTAL				
PADD I	0	201		•	•		
PADD II	107	0	0 232	0	0	0	201
PADD III	2,848	909	0	<b>9</b> 0 0	0	0	429
PADD IV	2,040	61	0	0	4 61	0	3,761
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	122
VI/PR	342	0	0	0	0	0	0 342
Total	3,297	1,171	232	90	65	0	4,855

TABLE A-20
HIGH PRODUCTION ALTERNATIVE FOR U.S.-FLAG
DOMESTIC TANKER DEMAND IN 1995

		Thousands of barrels per day	Tonnage factor	Thousands of DWT	Average size of vessel	Number of vessels
Crude oil						
Alaskan No	rth Slope					
Valdez	– USWC – Panama – Hawaii – VI (via Cape)	1,122 429 51 98	2.20 4.63 2.67	2,468 1,986 136 – <sup>a</sup>	124 178 73 – <sup>a</sup>	20 11 2 - a
Puerto Ai	rmuelles					
	– USG/PR – USEC	0 <b>98</b>	3.14	0 309	× 50	0 6
Chiriqui (	Grande					
	– USG/PR – USEC	131 200	1.79 2.37	234 473	50 50	5 10
Total Ala	skan North Slope			5,606		54
Offshore Ca	lifornia					
	– USG – USEC	0 0	5.31 5.72	0 0	43 41	0 0
Refined pet	roleum product					
Tanker ship	ments					
USG USWC USEC	– USEC – USWC – USEC	322	2.0	644 509 150	3 <b>8</b> 38 38	17 14 4
Total tan	ker shipments			1,303		35
Barge shipm	nents					
USG USWC USEC	– USEC – USWC – USEC	427	1.25	534 216 702	20 20 20	27 11 35
Total bar	ge shipments			1,452		73

a. Shipments to the Virgin Islands are not covered under the Jones Act; they can be carried in foreign-flag tankers.

TABLE A-21

ALASKAN EXPORT ALTERNATIVE FOR CRUDE OIL FLOWS IN 1990 (Thousands of barrels per day)

	PADDI	PADD II	PADD III	PADDIV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
Sources							
Crude oil production	76	760	3,420	532	2,812	0	7,600
Crude oil imports Receipts from other	1,098	1,536	2,942	30	264	330	6,200
PADDS	0	<u>778</u>	<u>464</u>	0	0	<u>119</u>	
Total crude supply	1,174	3,074	6,826	562	3,076	449	13,800
Uses							
Crude runs Shipments to other	1,129	3,074	6,134	476	2,339	449	13,600
PADDS	45	0	692	86	537	0	
Crude oil exports	0	0	0	0	200	0	200

TABLE A-22

ALASKAN EXPORT ALTERNATIVE FOR INTER-PADD

CRUDE OIL FLOWS IN 1990

(Thousands of barrels per day)

Shipments	PADDI	PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
			PIPELINE				
PADDI	0	0	45	0	0	0	45
PADD II	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD III	0	623	0	0	0	0	623
PADD IV	0	86	0	0	0	0	86
PADD V	0	0	400	0	0	0	400
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	709	445	0	0	0	1,154
							•
			WATERBOR	NE			
PADDI	0	0	- 0	0	0	0	0
PADDII	0	0	0	0	0	<u>0</u> ·	Ö
PADD III	0	69	0	0	0	Ō	69
PADD IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD V	0	0	18	0	0	119	137
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	69	18	0	0.	119	206
		50	TOTAL				
PADDI	0	0	45	0	0	0	45
PADDII	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD III	0	692	0	0	0	0	692
PADD IV	0	86	0	0	0	0	86
PADD V	0	0	418	0	0	119	537
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	778	463	0	0	119	1,360

TABLE A-23

ALASKAN EXPORT ALTERNATIVE
U.S.-FLAG DOMESTIC TANKER DEMAND IN 1990

	•	Thousands of barrels per day	Tonnage factor	Thousands of DWT	Average size of vessel	Number of vessels
Crude oil						
Alaskan Nor	rth Slope					
Valdez	– USWC – Panama – Hawaii – VI (via Cape)	1,409 47 54 90	2.20 4.63 2.67	3,100 215 144 _ a	124 178 73 _ a	25 1 2 _ a
Puerto Ar	rmuell <b>e</b> s – USG/PR – USEC	0	2.43 3.14	0	50 50	0 0
Chiriqui (	Grande – USG/PR – USEC	<b>47</b> 0	1.79 2.37	84 0	50 50	2 0
Total Alas	skan North Slope			3,543		30
Offshore Ca	lifornia					
	– USG – USEC	0 0	5.31 5.72	0	43 41	0

a. Shipments to the Virgin Islands are not covered under the Jones Act; they can be carried in foreign flag tankers.

TABLE A-24

ALASKAN EXPORT SCENARIO FOR CRUDE OIL FLOWS IN 1995 (Thousands of barrels per day)

	PADDI	PADD II	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
Sources							
Crude oil production	55	495	2,365	440	2,145	0	5,500
Crude oil imports Receipts from other	1,147	2,244	4,333	51	363	462	8,600
PADDS	0	425	41	0	0	0	
Total crude supply	1,202	3,164	6,739	491	2,508	462	14,100
Uses							
Crude runs Shipments to other	1,162	3,164	6,314	491	2,408	462	14,000
PADDS	40	0	425	0	0	0	
Crude oil exports	0	0	0	0	100	Ō	100

TABLE A-25

ALASKAN EXPORT SCENARIO FOR PROJECTED INTER-PADD CRUDE OIL FLOWS IN 1995 (Thousands of barrels per day)

Shipments	PADDI	PADDII	PADD III	PADD IV	PADD V	VI/PR	Total
			PIPELINE				
PADD I	0	0	40	0	0	0	40
PADD II	Ō	Ö	0	Ö	0	0	0
PADD III	0	383	Ō	Ö	Ö	Ö	383
PADD IV	0	0	0	0	0	Ö	0
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	383	40	0	0	0	423
			WATERBORI	ΝE			
PADDI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD II	0	0	Ö	Ö	Ö	Ö	0
PADD III	0	42	0	0	0	Ö	42
PADD IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	42	0	0	0	0	42
			TOTAL				
		•	TOTAL				
PADDI	0	40	0	0	0	. 0	40
PADD II	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD III	0	425	0	0	0	0	425
PADD IV	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PADD V	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VI/PR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	425	40	0	0	0	465

TABLE A-26

ALASKAN EXPORT SCENARIO FOR U.S.-FLAG
DOMESTIC TANKER DEMAND IN 1995

		Thousands of barrels per day	Factor	Thousands of DWT	Average size of vessel	Number of vessels
Crude oil						
Alaskan Nor	rth Slope					
Valdez	– USWC – Panama – Hawaii – VI (via Cape)	1,064 0 36 0	2.20 4.63 2.67 _ a	2,340 0 96 _ a	124 178 73 _ a	19 0 2 - a
Puerto Ar	rmuelles					
	<ul><li>USG/PR</li></ul>	0	2.43	0		0
	– USEC	0	3.14	0	50	Ŏ
Chiriqui C	Grande					
	<ul><li>USG/PR</li></ul>	0	1.79	0	50	0
	– USEC	0	2.37	0	50	0
Total Alaskan North Slope				2,655		21
Offshore Ca	lifornia					
	– USG	0	5.31	0	42	0
	– USEC	0	5.72	0	43 41	0
		J	J. / Z	U	41	0

a. Shipments to the Virgin Islands are not covered under the Jones Act; they can be carried in foreign-flag tankers.



02 055200.00

The state of